

1 QUINN EMANUEL URQUHART OLIVER & HEDGES, LLP

Kevin P.B. Johnson (Bar No. 177129)

2 kevinjohnson@quinnemanuel.com

555 Twin Dolphin Drive, Suite 560

3 Redwood Shores, California 94065

Telephone: (650) 801-5000

4 Facsimile: (650) 801-5100

5 Steven M. Anderson (Bar No. 144014)

stevenanderson@quinnemanuel.com

6 865 S. Figueroa Street, 10th Floor

Los Angeles, California 90017

7 Telephone: (650) 801-5000

Facsimile: (650) 801-5100

8 WILLIAMS & CONNOLLY LLP

9 Gerson A. Zweifach (Admitted *pro hac vice*)

gzweifach@wc.com

10 Thomas G. Hentoff (Admitted *pro hac vice*)

thentoff@wc.com

11 725 12th Street NW

Washington, D.C. 20005

12 Telephone: (202) 434-5000

Facsimile: (202) 434-5029

13 Attorneys for Plaintiff/Defendant Sony

14 Corporation and Consolidated Defendant

Sony Corporation of America

16 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

17 CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

18 WESTERN DIVISION

19 SONY CORPORATION,

20 Plaintiff,

21 vs.

22 VIZIO, INC.,

23 Defendant.

CASE NO. CV08-1135 RGK (FMOx)

DISCOVERY MATTER

**SONY'S SUPPLEMENT BRIEF RE:
MOTION TO COMPEL A
FURTHER RESPONSE TO SONY'S
INTERROGATORY NO. 20**

Hearing Date: October 28, 2009

Hearing Time: 10:00 a.m.

Before: Hon. Fernando M. Olguin

1 Sony's motion to compel should be granted, and Vizio should be required to
2 provide a full and complete response to Sony's Interrogatory No. 20, regarding
3 Vizio's claimed product disparagement and Lanham Act damages, without any
4 further delay.

5 Vizio does not argue that any portion of Sony's damages interrogatory seeks
6 irrelevant information or is otherwise improper in any respect. Yet Vizio offers no
7 serious justification for its failure to provide any answer to a proper interrogatory
8 served on it on June 12, 2009, more than four months ago. Amazingly, Vizio's
9 principal argument, made October 7—fewer than four weeks before the close of fact
10 discovery—is that Sony's interrogatory “is premature at this time.” (Docket No.
11 126-2 at 3 (Joint Stipulation re: Motion to Compel).)

12 For a number of reasons, Vizio is wrong and has no justification for its
13 protracted refusal to provide necessary discovery.

14 1. The parties agree that New Jersey law applies to Vizio's product
15 disparagement claim against Sony. (Docket No. 113 at 13, 17, 18 (Vizio Opp. to
16 Sony Motion for Judgment on the Pleadings).) Under New Jersey law, proof of
17 “special damages” (Docket No. 126-2 at 3-4 (Sony Interrogatory No. 20, seeking
18 information about special damages)) is not relevant merely to the extent of a
19 plaintiff's remedy. Instead, it is an essential element of a plaintiff's product
20 disparagement claim itself, subjecting a plaintiff to dismissal or summary judgment
21 for failure to provide the very information that Sony Interrogatory No. 20 seeks: “A
22 trade libel or product disparagement claim . . . requires that a prevailing plaintiff
23 prove special damages by establishing pecuniary loss that has been realized or
24 liquidated, such as lost sales, or the loss of prospective contracts with customers.”
25 *Graco v. PMC Global, Inc.*, 2009 WL 904010, at *35 (D.N.J. March 31, 2009).

26 2. Vizio has attempted to satisfy this special damages requirement by
27 alleging that the statements of a Sony executive that it challenges forced Vizio to
28

1 spend money on corrective television advertising. (Docket No. 113 at 16 (quoting
2 Vizio Compl. ¶ 124).)

3 In opposition to this motion to compel, Vizio asserts that its product
4 disparagement damages “involve abstract concepts” (Docket No. 126-2 at 3), and
5 thus could not have been answered over the last four months. But Vizio’s assertion
6 here is directly contradicted by Vizio’s assertion last month, in opposition to Sony’s
7 motion for judgment on the pleadings, where Vizio argued that it had adequately
8 alleged special damages in the form of “mitigation costs that include Vizio’s
9 expenditures for corrective advertising to counteract Sony’s statements.” (Docket
10 No. 113 at 16.) These are not “abstract concepts.”

11 3. Accordingly, Vizio has, and has had for months, all the information it
12 needs in order to answer Interrogatory No. 20’s request that Vizio set forth “all
13 evidence on which you base” the corrective-advertising damages and “an
14 explanation of how you computed the item of damages.” (Docket No. 126-2 at 3-
15 4). Such easily accessible information includes, at a minimum, concrete categories
16 of information such as advertising agency and media-placement invoices. By
17 withholding this information for months, Vizio has deprived Sony of the opportunity
18 to test Vizio’s assertions through fact discovery. Vizio’s contention that its plan
19 ultimately to answer the interrogatory “before expert depositions” means that “Sony
20 will suffer no prejudice” (Docket No. 126-2 at 3) is, therefore, wrong.

21 4. That Vizio has no excuse for failing to provide basic information about
22 the cost of its alleged corrective advertising is confirmed by the case Vizio itself
23 cites in opposition to the motion to compel. In *Cable & Computer Technology, Inc.*
24 *v. Lockheed Saunders, Inc.*, 175 F.R.D. 646 (C.D. Cal. 1997), the defendant moved
25 to compel an answer to a similar damages interrogatory, which asked the plaintiff to
26 describe each component of damages it allegedly suffered and to state the dollar
27 value of each component and how the dollar value was calculated. *Id.* at 650-51 &
28 n.3. Vizio quotes out of context a passage from *Cable & Computer Technology* for

1 the proposition that “it is too early for plaintiff to provide expert opinions on the
2 subject of damages” (Docket No. 126-2 at 12-13 (quoting *Cable &*
3 *Computer Tech.*, 175 F.R.D. at 652)). In context, the language makes clear that the
4 possibility of expert testimony on damages is not an excuse for failing to provide an
5 answer on the subject. Thus, granting the defendant’s motion to compel, the *Cable*
6 *& Computer Technology* court held: “[A]*lthough* it is too early for plaintiff to
7 provide expert opinions on the subject of damages, *plaintiff, may, at this time,*
8 *answer interrogatory no. 1 based on the information it has to date.*” 175 F.R.D. at
9 652 (emphasis added to parts of passage omitted by Vizio).

10 * * *

11 For the reasons set forth in Sony’s portion of the parties’ Joint Stipulation and
12 herein, Sony respectfully requests that the Court grant Sony’s motion to compel in
13 its entirety.

14
15 DATED: October 14, 2009

WILLIAMS & CONNOLLY LLP

17 By /s/ Thomas G. Hentoff
18 Thomas G. Hentoff
19 Attorneys for Sony Corporation and Sony
20 Corporation of America
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28